

Generalized quantum operations and almost sharp quantum effects*

Shen Jun^{1,2}, Wu Junde^{1†}

¹*Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, P. R. China*

²*Department of Mathematics, Anhui Normal University, Wuhu 241003, P. R. China*

Abstract

In this paper, we study generalized quantum operations and almost sharp quantum effects, our results generalize and improve some important conclusions in [2] and [3].

Key Words. Quantum operations, fixed points, almost sharp quantum effects.

This paper is to commemorate my outstanding student Shen Jun, who passed away accidently on July 1, 2009. Shen Jun made great contributions in sequential effect algebra theory. He solved four open problems which were presented by Professor Gudder in International Journal of Theoretical Physics, 44 (2005), 2199-2205.

1. Introduction

Let H be a Hilbert space, $B(H)$ be the set of bounded linear operators on H , $P(H)$ be the set of projection operators on H , $T(H)$ be the set of trace class operators on H , and $\Gamma = \{A_\alpha, A_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ be a set of operators, where $A_\alpha \in B(H)$ satisfy $\sum_\alpha A_\alpha A_\alpha^* \leq$

*This project is supported by Natural Science Found of China (10771191 and 10471124).

†E-mail: wjd@zju.edu.cn

I . A map $\Phi_\Gamma : B(H) \longrightarrow B(H); B \longmapsto \sum_\alpha A_\alpha B A_\alpha^*$ is called a *generalized quantum operation*. Each element of $\Gamma = \{A_\alpha, A_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ is said to be a operation element of Φ_Γ . If $B \geq 0$, then it is obvious that $\sum_\alpha A_\alpha B A_\alpha^*$ converges in the strong operator topology, so $\sum_\alpha A_\alpha B A_\alpha^*$ converges in the strong operator topology for any $B \in B(H)$. If $\Phi_\Gamma(I) = \sum_\alpha A_\alpha A_\alpha^* = I$, then Φ_Γ is said to be *unital*, if $\sum_\alpha A_\alpha^* A_\alpha = I$, then Φ_Γ is said to be *trace preserving*, if $\sum_\alpha A_\alpha^* A_\alpha \leq I$, then Φ_Γ is said to be *trace nonincreasing*, if $A_\alpha^* = A_\alpha$ for every α , then Φ_Γ is said to be *self-adjoint*.

The set of fixed points of Φ_Γ is $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma} = \{B \in B(H) \mid \Phi_\Gamma(B) = B\}$. Obviously $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$ is closed under the involution $*$. The commutant $\Gamma' = \{B \in B(H) \mid B A_\alpha = A_\alpha B, B A_\alpha^* = A_\alpha^* B, \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ of Γ is a von Neumann algebra.

Quantum operations frequently occur in quantum measurement theory, quantum probability, quantum computation, and quantum information theory ([1]). If an operator A is invariant under the quantum operation Φ_Γ , in physics, it implies that A is not disturbed by the action of Φ_Γ . So, the following problem is interesting and important: if A is a Φ_Γ -fixed point, is A commutative with each operation element of Φ_Γ ? In general, the answer is not and some sufficient conditions under which the answer is yes were given ([2]).

On the other hand, quantum effects are represented by operators on a Hilbert space H satisfying that $0 \leq A \leq I$, and sharp quantum effects are represented by projections. An quantum effect A is said to be almost sharp if $A = P Q P$ for projections P and Q ([3]). In [3], some characterizations of almost sharp quantum effects were obtained.

In this paper, we generalize some theorems in [2] from quantum operations to generalized quantum operations, from unital to not necessarily unital, and from trace preserving to trace nonincreasing, we also generalize some results in [3] and give some more characterizations for almost sharp quantum effects.

2. Generalized quantum operations

Lemma 2.1. If Φ_Γ is a generalized quantum operation, $B, BB^* \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$, then $BA_\alpha = A_\alpha B$ for every α .

Proof. Since $B \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$, we have $B^* \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$. Let we denote $[B, A_\alpha] = BA_\alpha - A_\alpha B$. Note that $0 \leq [B, A_\alpha][B, A_\alpha]^* = (BA_\alpha - A_\alpha B)(A_\alpha^* B^* - B^* A_\alpha^*) = BA_\alpha A_\alpha^* B^* + A_\alpha B B^* A_\alpha^* - A_\alpha B A_\alpha^* B^* - B A_\alpha B^* A_\alpha^*$.

Thus $0 \leq \sum_\alpha [B, A_\alpha][B, A_\alpha]^* = B(\sum_\alpha A_\alpha A_\alpha^*)B^* + \Phi_\Gamma(BB^*) - \Phi_\Gamma(B)B^* - B\Phi_\Gamma(B^*) = B(\sum_\alpha A_\alpha A_\alpha^*)B^* - BB^* \leq 0$.

So we conclude that $[B, A_\alpha] = 0$ for every α . That is, $BA_\alpha = A_\alpha B$ for every α .

Theorem 2.1. If Φ_Γ is a generalized quantum operation, $B, B^*B, BB^* \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$, then $B \in \Gamma'$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, $BA_\alpha = A_\alpha B$ for every α . Since $B \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$, we have $B^* \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$. Thus by Lemma 2.1 again, $B^*A_\alpha = A_\alpha B^*$ for every α . Taking adjoint, we have $BA_\alpha^* = A_\alpha^* B$ for every α . So we conclude that $B \in \Gamma'$.

Theorem 2.2. If Φ_Γ is a self-adjoint generalized quantum operation, $B, BB^* \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$, then $B \in \Gamma'$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, $BA_\alpha = A_\alpha B$ for every α . Since $A_\alpha^* = A_\alpha$ for every α , we conclude that $B \in \Gamma'$.

We denote the set of selfadjoint elements in $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$ by $Re(B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma})$.

Theorem 2.3. If Φ_Γ is a generalized quantum operation, then the following conditions are all equivalent:

- (1) $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma} \subseteq \Gamma'$;
- (2) If $B \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$, then $B^*B \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$;
- (3) If $B \in Re(B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma})$, then $B^2 \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): If $B \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$, then $B \in \Gamma'$. Thus $B^* \in \Gamma'$. So $\Phi_\Gamma(B^*B) = \sum_\alpha A_\alpha B^* B A_\alpha^* = B^* \sum_\alpha A_\alpha B A_\alpha^* = B^* \Phi_\Gamma(B) = B^*B$. Thus $B^*B \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) is obvious.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1): By Theorem 2.1, If $B \in Re(B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma})$, then $B \in \Gamma'$. That is, $Re(B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}) \subseteq \Gamma'$. Since $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$ is closed under the involution $*$, we conclude that $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma} \subseteq \Gamma'$.

Lemma 2.2. If $\{C_\beta\}_\beta \subset B(H)$, $\{C_\beta\}_\beta$ is a nondecreasing net of positive operators converging to some $C_0 \in B(H)$ in the strong operator topology, then $tr(C_\beta) \longrightarrow tr(C_0)$, here the trace function $tr(\cdot)$ can take value $+\infty$.

Proof. Since $0 \leq C_\beta \leq C_0$, we have $tr(C_\beta) \leq tr(C_0)$.

For any constant $\xi < tr(C_0) = \sum_{\gamma \in F} \langle C_0 x_\gamma, x_\gamma \rangle$ (here $\{x_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in F}$ is an orthonormal bases of H), there exists a finite subset $F_0 \subseteq F$ such that $\xi < \sum_{\gamma \in F_0} \langle C_0 x_\gamma, x_\gamma \rangle$. Since $\sum_{\gamma \in F_0} \langle C_\beta x_\gamma, x_\gamma \rangle \longrightarrow \sum_{\gamma \in F_0} \langle C_0 x_\gamma, x_\gamma \rangle$, we have $tr(C_\beta) \geq \sum_{\gamma \in F_0} \langle C_\beta x_\gamma, x_\gamma \rangle > \xi$ for all sufficiently large β . Thus $tr(C_\beta) \longrightarrow tr(C_0)$.

Theorem 2.4. Let Φ_Γ be a trace nonincreasing generalized quantum operation, $B \in T(H)_+$, then $\Phi_\Gamma(B) \in T(H)_+$ and $tr(\Phi_\Gamma(B)) \leq tr(B)$.

Proof. Let F be a finite subset of Λ , then $tr(\sum_{\alpha \in F} A_\alpha B A_\alpha^*) = tr(\sum_{\alpha \in F} A_\alpha^* A_\alpha B) \leq \|\sum_{\alpha \in F} A_\alpha^* A_\alpha\| tr(B) \leq tr(B)$. Ordering all such F by including, $\{\sum_{\alpha \in F} A_\alpha B A_\alpha^*\}_F$ is a nondecreasing net of positive operators converging to $\Phi_\Gamma(B)$ in the strong operator topology. So by Lemma 2.2 we have $tr(\sum_{\alpha \in F} A_\alpha B A_\alpha^*) \longrightarrow tr(\Phi_\Gamma(B))$. Thus $tr(\Phi_\Gamma(B)) \leq tr(B)$.

A generalized quantum operation Φ_Γ is *faithful* if for any $B \in B(H)$, $\Phi_\Gamma(B^* B) = 0$ implies $B = 0$.

Theorem 2.5. Let Φ_Γ be a trace preserving generalized quantum operation. We have

- (1). Φ_Γ is faithful.
- (2). If $B \in T(H)$, then $\Phi_\Gamma(B) \in T(H)$ and $tr(\Phi_\Gamma(B)) = tr(B)$.

Proof. (1). Suppose $B \in B(H)$, $\Phi_\Gamma(B^* B) = 0$. Then $\sum_{\alpha} A_\alpha B^* B A_\alpha^* = 0$. So $B A_\alpha^* = 0$ for every α . Thus $B = B \sum_{\alpha} A_\alpha^* A_\alpha = 0$.

(2). Firstly we suppose $B \in T(H)_+$. By Theorem 2.4 we have $\Phi_\Gamma(B) \in T(H)_+$. Let F be a finite subset of Λ , ordering all such F by including, $\{\sum_{\alpha \in F} A_\alpha B A_\alpha^*\}_F$ is a nondecreasing net of positive operators converging to $\Phi_\Gamma(B)$ in the strong operator topology. So by Lemma 2.2 we have $tr(\sum_{\alpha \in F} A_\alpha B A_\alpha^*) \longrightarrow tr(\Phi_\Gamma(B))$.

Since Φ_Γ is trace preserving, $\{\sum_{\alpha \in F} B^{\frac{1}{2}} A_\alpha^* A_\alpha B^{\frac{1}{2}}\}_F$ is a nondecreasing net of positive operators converging to B in the strong operator topology. So by Lemma 2.2

we have $\text{tr}(\sum_{\alpha \in F} B^{\frac{1}{2}} A_{\alpha}^* A_{\alpha} B^{\frac{1}{2}}) \longrightarrow \text{tr}(B)$. But $\text{tr}(\sum_{\alpha \in F} A_{\alpha} B A_{\alpha}^*) = \text{tr}(\sum_{\alpha \in F} B^{\frac{1}{2}} A_{\alpha}^* A_{\alpha} B^{\frac{1}{2}})$ for every F , so we conclude that $\text{tr}(\Phi_{\Gamma}(B)) = \text{tr}(B)$. By linearity, the result for arbitrary $B \in T(H)$ now follows.

The next Lemma 2.3 is from [4], it is presumed in [4] that all linear maps on C^* -algebras preserve the identity, we modify the proof slightly such that it suit for our need.

Lemma 2.3. If $\mathfrak{R}_1, \mathfrak{R}_2$ are C^* -algebras, $\phi : \mathfrak{R}_1 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R}_2$ is a 2-positive linear map, $\|\phi(I)\| \leq 1$, then $\phi(C^*C) \geq \phi(C)^*\phi(C)$ for every $C \in \mathfrak{R}_1$.

Proof. Let $T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & C^* \\ C & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in M_2(\mathfrak{R}_1) = \mathfrak{R}_1 \otimes M_2$, here M_2 denote the C^* -algebra of 2×2 complex matrices. Then $T = T^*$.

Since $\phi \otimes 1_2 : M_2(\mathfrak{R}_1) \longrightarrow M_2(\mathfrak{R}_2)$ is a positive linear map and $\|\phi \otimes 1_2\| \leq 1$, by [5] Theorem 1 we have $(\phi \otimes 1_2)(T^2) \geq ((\phi \otimes 1_2)(T))^2$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{While } T^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} C^*C & 0 \\ 0 & CC^* \end{pmatrix}, (\phi \otimes 1_2)(T^2) = \begin{pmatrix} \phi(C^*C) & 0 \\ 0 & \phi(CC^*) \end{pmatrix}, \\ (\phi \otimes 1_2)(T) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \phi(C^*) \\ \phi(C) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, ((\phi \otimes 1_2)(T))^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi(C)^*\phi(C) & 0 \\ 0 & \phi(C)\phi(C)^* \end{pmatrix}. \\ \text{Thus } \phi(C^*C) &\geq \phi(C)^*\phi(C). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that a generalized quantum operation is completely positive and satisfies the conditions in Lemma 2.3.

An operator $W \in T(H)$ is *faithful* if for any $A \in B(H)_+$, $\text{tr}(W^*AW) = 0$ implies $A = 0$.

Theorem 2.6. Let Φ_{Γ} be a trace nonincreasing generalized quantum operation. We have

- (1). $B(H)^{\Phi_{\Gamma}} \cap T(H) \subseteq \Gamma' \cap T(H)$;
- (2). If $\dim(H) < \infty$, then $B(H)^{\Phi_{\Gamma}} \subseteq \Gamma'$;
- (3). If there exists a faithful operator $W \in T(H) \cap \Gamma'$, then $B(H)^{\Phi_{\Gamma}} \subseteq \Gamma'$.

Proof. (1). Suppose $B \in B(H)^{\Phi_{\Gamma}} \cap T(H)$. Thus $B^*B \in T(H)_+$. By Lemma 2.3 we have $\Phi_{\Gamma}(B^*B) \geq \Phi_{\Gamma}(B)^*\Phi_{\Gamma}(B) = B^*B$. By Theorem 2.4 we have

$\Phi_\Gamma(B^*B) \in T(H)_+$ and $\text{tr}(\Phi_\Gamma(B^*B)) = \text{tr}(B^*B)$. That is, $\text{tr}(\Phi_\Gamma(B^*B) - B^*B) = 0$. So $\Phi_\Gamma(B^*B) = B^*B$. We conclude that $B^*B \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$. Since $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$ is closed under the involution $*$, we also have $B^* \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma} \cap T(H)$. Similarly we have $BB^* \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$. By Theorem 2.1, We conclude that $B \in \Gamma'$. That is, $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma} \cap T(H) \subseteq \Gamma' \cap T(H)$.

(2) follows from (1) immediately.

(3). Suppose $B \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$. By Lemma 2.3 we have $\Phi_\Gamma(B^*B) \geq \Phi_\Gamma(B)^*\Phi_\Gamma(B) = B^*B$. Thus By Theorem 2.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \text{tr}(W^*(\Phi_\Gamma(B^*B) - B^*B)W) \\ &= \text{tr}(W^*\Phi_\Gamma(B^*B)W) - \text{tr}(W^*B^*BW) \\ &= \text{tr}(\Phi_\Gamma(W^*B^*BW)) - \text{tr}(W^*B^*BW) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

So $\text{tr}(W^*(\Phi_\Gamma(B^*B) - B^*B)W) = 0$. Since W is faithful, we conclude that $\Phi_\Gamma(B^*B) = B^*B$. That is, $B^*B \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$. Since $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$ is closed under the involution $*$, we also have $B^* \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$. Similarly we have $BB^* \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$. By Theorem 2.1, we conclude that $B \in \Gamma'$. That is, $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma} \subseteq \Gamma'$.

The next theorem is a direct corollary of Theorem 2.6 (2), but we give a simple elementary proof instead.

Theorem 2.7. Let Φ_Γ be a generalized quantum operation, $\Gamma = \{A_\alpha, A_\alpha^*\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ is commutative and $\dim(H) < \infty$, then $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma} \subseteq \Gamma'$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.5.5 in [6], $\{A_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ can be diagonalized simultaneously. That is, there exists a set of pairwise orthogonal nonzero projections $\{P_k\}_k$ such that $\sum_k P_k = I$, $A_\alpha = \sum_k \lambda_{k,\alpha} P_k$. We also can suppose that if $k_1 \neq k_2$, then there exists some α such that $\lambda_{k_1,\alpha} \neq \lambda_{k_2,\alpha}$. In fact, if not, we can combine P_{k_1} and P_{k_2} into one projection.

Since $\sum_\alpha A_\alpha A_\alpha^* \leq I$, we have $\sum_\alpha |\lambda_{k,\alpha}|^2 \leq 1$ for every k . Let $\xi_k = \{\lambda_{k,\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \in l^2(\Lambda)$, then $\|\xi_k\| \leq 1$ for every k . Thus if $\langle \xi_{k_1}, \xi_{k_2} \rangle = 1$, then by Schwarz inequality we have $\xi_{k_1} = \xi_{k_2}$. So by the assumption above, we conclude that $k_1 = k_2$.

Now we suppose $B \in B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma}$. Then $B = \sum_{\alpha} A_{\alpha} B A_{\alpha}^*$. So $P_k B P_l = (\sum_{\alpha} \lambda_{k,\alpha} \overline{\lambda_{l,\alpha}}) P_k B P_l = \langle \xi_k, \xi_l \rangle P_k B P_l$ for every k, l . Thus we have $P_k B P_l = 0$ for $k \neq l$. So $B = \sum_k P_k B P_k$. We conclude that $B P_k = P_k B$ and $B \in \Gamma'$. That is, $B(H)^{\Phi_\Gamma} \subseteq \Gamma'$.

3. Almost sharp quantum effects

Firstly, let $\mathcal{E}(H)$ be the set of self-adjoint operators on H satisfying that $0 \leq A \leq I$. For $A \in B(H)$, denote $Ker(A) = \{x \in H \mid Ax = 0\}$ and $Ran(A) = \{Ax \mid x \in H\}$. If $A, B \in \mathcal{E}(H)$, we call $A \circ B = A^{\frac{1}{2}} B A^{\frac{1}{2}}$ the sequential product of A and B (see [7-10]).

Lemma 3.1 ([7-8]). If $A, B \in \mathcal{E}(H)$, $A \circ B \in P(H)$, then $AB = BA$.

We generalize Corollary 3 in [3] as the following Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.1. Suppose $P \in P(H)$, $A \in \mathcal{E}(H)$, P or $A \in T(H)$, then the following conditions are all equivalent:

- (1) $P \circ A \in P(H)$;
- (2) $tr(PA) = tr(PAPA)$;
- (3) $PA \in P(H)$;
- (4) PA is idempotent.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3). By Lemma 3.1 we have $PA = AP$. Thus $PA = PAP = P \circ A \in P(H)$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) $\Rightarrow$ (2) is obvious.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Since $P \circ A \in T(H)$, we have $(P \circ A)^2 \in T(H)$.

$tr(P \circ A) = tr(PAP) = tr(PA) = tr(PAPA) = tr(PAPAP) = tr((PAP)^2) = tr((P \circ A)^2)$.

Since $0 \leq P \circ A \leq I$, we have $(P \circ A)^2 \leq P \circ A$. It follows from $tr(P \circ A - (P \circ A)^2) = 0$ that $P \circ A = (P \circ A)^2$. So $P \circ A \in P(H)$.

Let M be a von Neumann algebra on H . The set of effects in M is $\mathcal{E}(M) = \{A \in M \mid 0 \leq A \leq I\}$. The set of projections or sharp effects in M is $P(M) =$

$\{P \in M \mid P = P^* = P^2\}$. We denote the usual Murray-von Neumann relations on $P(M)$ by $\preceq$, $\succeq$ and $\sim$.

For $A \in \mathcal{E}(M)$, defining the *negation* of A by $A' = I - A$. if $A = PQP$ for some $P, Q \in P(M)$, we say A is an *almost sharp* element in M . We say that A is *nearly sharp* if both A and A' are almost sharp ([3]).

We denote the set of almost sharp elements in M by M_{as} .

For $A \in \mathcal{E}(M)$, we denote the projection onto $\overline{Ran(A)}$ and $Ker(A)$ by P_A and N_A respectively. It is easy to know that $P_A + N_A = I$.

Note that if $A \in \mathcal{E}(M)$ has the form $A = PQP$ for some $P, Q \in P(M)$, then $P_A \leq P$, thus we also have that $A = P_A Q P_A$ ([3]).

Lemma 3.2 ([3]). Let $A \in \mathcal{E}(M)$. Then

- (1). A is almost sharp iff $P_{AA'} \preceq N_A$;
- (2). A is nearly sharp iff $P_{AA'} \preceq N_A$ and $P_{AA'} \preceq N_{A'}$;
- (3). $P_{AA'} = P_A - N_{A'} = I - N_A - N_{A'}$.

Now, we generalize Theorem 10 in [3] as the following Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3:

Theorem 3.2. Suppose $P \in P(M)$, then the following conditions are all equivalent:

- (1). $P \preceq P'$;
- (2). $[0, P] \subseteq M_{as}$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Suppose $0 \leq A \leq P$. Then $P_A \leq P$, $N_A \geq P'$. Thus $P_{AA'} \leq P_A \leq P \preceq P' \leq N_A$. That is, $P_{AA'} \preceq N_A$. So by Lemma 3.2 we have $A \in M_{as}$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let $A = \frac{1}{2}P$, then $A \in [0, P] \subseteq M_{as}$. So by Lemma 3.2 we have $P_{AA'} \preceq N_A$.

It is easy to see that $P_A = P$, $N_A = P'$, $N_{A'} = 0$. By Lemma 3.2 we have $P_{AA'} = P_A - N_{A'} = P$. Thus $P = P_{AA'} \preceq N_A = P'$.

Theorem 3.3. Suppose $P \in P(M)$, then the following conditions are all equivalent:

- (1). $P \sim P'$;
- (2). $[0, P] \cup [0, P'] \subseteq M_{as}$;
- (3). If $A \in \mathcal{E}(M)$, $AP = PA$, then $A = P_1Q_1P_1 + P_2Q_2P_2$ with $P_i, Q_i \in P(M)$ and $P_1 \leq P, P_2 \leq P'$.

Proof. (1) $\iff$ (2). By Theorem 3.2.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3). Suppose $A \in \mathcal{E}(M)$, $AP = PA$. Then $A = PAP + P'AP'$. Since $PAP \in [0, P]$ and $P'AP' \in [0, P']$, we have $PAP, P'AP' \in M_{as}$. Thus, we can prove the result easily.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Suppose $0 \leq A \leq P$. It is easy to see that $AP = PA = A$. Thus $A = P_1Q_1P_1 + P_2Q_2P_2$ with $P_i, Q_i \in P(M)$ and $P_1 \leq P, P_2 \leq P'$. So $A = PAP = P_1Q_1P_1$. That is, $A \in M_{as}$. We conclude that $[0, P] \subseteq M_{as}$. Similarly $[0, P'] \subseteq M_{as}$.

Let $\mathcal{B}[0, 1]$ be the set of bounded Borel functions on interval $[0, 1]$. Suppose $A \in \mathcal{E}(M)$, $h \in \mathcal{B}[0, 1]$, $0 \leq h \leq 1$, then $h(A) \in \mathcal{E}(M)$.

Theorem 3.4. Suppose $A \in \mathcal{E}(M)$, $h \in \mathcal{B}[0, 1]$, $0 \leq h \leq 1$, $h(0) = 0$, $h(1) = 1$. We have

- (1). $N_A \leq N_{h(A)}$, $N_{A'} \leq N_{h(A)'}$, $P_{h(A)h(A)'} \leq P_{AA'}$;
- (2). If A is almost sharp, then $h(A)$ is almost sharp;
- (3). If A is nearly sharp, then $h(A)$ is nearly sharp.

Proof. (1). If $Ax = 0$, then $h(A)(x) = h(0)x = 0$. Thus $Ker(A) \subseteq Ker(h(A))$. That is, $N_A \leq N_{h(A)}$.

If $Ax = x$, then $h(A)(x) = h(1)x = x$. Thus $Ker(I - A) \subset Ker(I - h(A))$. That is, $N_{A'} \leq N_{h(A)'}$. Thus by Lemma 3.2 we have $P_{AA'} = I - N_A - N_{A'} \geq I - N_{h(A)} - N_{h(A)'} = P_{h(A)h(A)'}$.

(2). If A is almost sharp, by Lemma 3.2 we have $P_{AA'} \preceq N_A$. From (1) we have $P_{h(A)h(A)'} \leq P_{AA'} \preceq N_A \leq N_{h(A)}$. That is, $P_{h(A)h(A)'} \preceq N_{h(A)}$. Thus by Lemma 3.2 again $h(A)$ is almost sharp.

(3). If A is nearly sharp, by Lemma 3.2 we have $P_{AA'} \preceq N_A$ and $P_{AA'} \preceq N_{A'}$. From (1) we have $P_{h(A)h(A)'} \leq P_{AA'} \preceq N_A \leq N_{h(A)}$ and $P_{h(A)h(A)'} \leq P_{AA'} \preceq N_{A'} \leq N_{h(A)'}$. That is, $P_{h(A)h(A)'} \preceq N_{h(A)}$ and $P_{h(A)h(A)'} \preceq N_{h(A)'}$. Thus by Lemma 3.2

again $h(A)$ is nearly sharp.

Let $C[0, 1]$ be the set of continuous functions on interval $[0, 1]$. Suppose $h \in C[0, 1]$, we say h satisfy *kernel condition* if the following three conditions hold:

- (1). $0 \leq h \leq 1$;
- (2). $h(0) = 0, h(1) = 1$;
- (3). h is strictly monotonous.

Suppose $A \in \mathcal{E}(M)$, $h \in C[0, 1]$ satisfies kernel condition, then it is easy to see that $h(A) \in \mathcal{E}(M)$, $h^{-1} \in C[0, 1]$ also satisfies kernel condition and $A = h^{-1}(h(A))$.

Theorem 3.5. Suppose $A \in \mathcal{E}(M)$, $h \in C[0, 1]$ satisfy kernel condition. We have

- (1). $N_A = N_{h(A)}$, $N_{A'} = N_{h(A)'}$, $P_{AA'} = P_{h(A)h(A)'}$;
- (2). A is almost sharp if and only if $h(A)$ is almost sharp;
- (3). A is nearly sharp if and only if $h(A)$ is nearly sharp.

Proof. (1). By Theorem 3.4, we have $N_A \leq N_{h(A)}$, $N_{A'} \leq N_{h(A)'}$, $P_{h(A)h(A)'} \leq P_{AA'}$. Since $h(A) \in \mathcal{E}(M)$, $h^{-1} \in C[0, 1]$ satisfy kernel condition, and $A = h^{-1}(h(A))$, by Theorem 3.4 again, we have $N_A \geq N_{h(A)}$, $N_{A'} \geq N_{h(A)'}$, $P_{h(A)h(A)'} \geq P_{AA'}$. Thus the conclusion follows.

(2) and (3) follow from Lemma 3.2 and (1) immediately.

Corollary 3.1. Suppose $A \in \mathcal{E}(M)$, t is a positive number. Then

- (1). A is almost sharp if and only if A^t is almost sharp.
- (2). A is nearly sharp if and only if A^t is nearly sharp.

References

- [1]. Nielsen, M. and Chuang, J. Quantum computation and quantum information, Cambridge University Press, 2000
- [2]. A. Arias, A. Gheondea, S. Gudder. Fixed points of quantum operations. J. Math. Phys. 43(2002), 5872.

- [3]. A. Arias, S. Gudder. Almost sharp quantum effects. J. Math. Phys. 45(2004), 4196.
- [4]. M. D. Choi. A Schwarz inequality for positive linear maps on C^* -algebras. Illinois J. Math. 18(1974), 565.
- [5]. R. V. Kadison. A generalized Schwarz inequality and algebraic invariants for operator algebras. Ann. of Math. 56(1952), 494.
- [6]. R. Horn, C. Johnson. Matrix Analysis. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [7]. S. Gudder, G. Nagy. Sequential quantum measurements. J. Math. Phys. 42(2001), 5212.
- [8]. S. Gudder, R. Greechie. Sequential products on effect algebras. Rep. Math. Phys. 49(2002), 87.
- [9]. Weihua Liu, Junde Wu. A uniqueness problem of the sequence product on operator effect algebra $\mathcal{E}(H)$. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 42 (2009), 185206.
- [10]. Jun Shen, Junde Wu. Sequential product on standard effect algebra $\mathcal{E}(H)$. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 44 (2009).

Appendix: Collected papers of Shen Jun

- [1]. Jun Shen, Junde Wu. Not each sequential effect algebra is sharply dominating. Physics Letters A. 373 (2009), 1708-1712.
- [2]. Jun Shen, Junde Wu. Sequential product on standard effect algebra $\mathcal{E}(H)$. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 44 (2009).
- [3]. Jun Shen, Junde Wu. Remarks on the sequential effect algebras. Reports on Math. Phys. 63 (2009), 441-446.
- [4]. Jun Shen, Junde Wu. The average value inequality in sequential effect algebras. Acta Math. Sinica, English Series. Accepted for publishing.
- [5]. Jun Shen, Junde Wu. The n-th root of sequential effect algebras. Submitted.
- [6]. Jun Shen, Junde Wu. Spectral representation of infimum of bounded quantum observables. Submitted.
- [7]. Jun Shen, Junde Wu. Generalized quantum operations and almost sharp quan-

tum effects. Submitted.